REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 17, 20 and 21 are amended. Support for the amendment to the claims may be found throughout the original disclosure. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-25 will remain pending in the patent application.

Claims 10 and 21-23 were objected to because of informalities noted in the Office Action. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 is amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

With respect to claim 21, the Examiner indicates that the language "'at least two of ...communication with one another' is confusing and unclear." (See page 2 of the Office Action). While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's determination and note that the Examiner has not provided a basis in 37 C.F.R. or 35 U.S.C. to support this objection, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, claim 21 is amended to recite that at least two of the plurality of connectors are connected to each other. It is respectfully submitted that this amendment obviates the objection to claims 21-23.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 10 and 21-23 are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to. In connection with this objection, the Examiner asserts that the language "'at least two of ...communication with one another' is confusing and unclear". (See page 2 of the Office Action). In response, this language has been deleted from claim 21, thus rendering moot the objection to the specification.

Claims 1, 8, 11-12, 17-18, 20-21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on O'Brien *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6, 120,327) (hereinafter "O'Brien"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is patentable over O'Brien at least because this claim recites an electronic assembly, which comprises, *inter alia*, "a molded body formed around the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors."

By way of review, O'Brien discloses a wire harness that includes a plurality of wires 50 encased in a continuous polymer sheath. (See FIG. 1 and col. 1, lines 45-47 of O'Brien).

Connectors 52 may be connected to the plurality of wires 50. (See FIG. 1 and col. 1, lines 16-25 of O'Brien). O'Brien also discloses that a mold 20 (identified by the Office Action as the "molded body" of claim 1), which is used to form the wire harness, includes a through having a main trunk continuous with a plurality of branches. (See FIG. 1 and col. 1, lines 45-52 of O'Brien).

Having said this, Applicants respectfully submit that there is nothing in O'Brien that remotely discloses, teaches or suggests each and every feature of claim 1 including the features noted above.

The Office Action equates the mold 20 of O'Brien with the molded body of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. The mold 20 of O'Brien is merely **used to form** the polymer sheath around the wire harness. However, the mold 20 of O'Brien is **not** part of an electronic assembly and does not completely encapsulate the wire harness, as recited in claim 1. In support of this, O'Brien discloses that once the polymer foam is formed on the wires 50, the wire harness is **removed** from the mold 20. Specifically, O'Brien discloses that the wires 50 are routed along the main trunk 28 and branches 30 of the mold 20, and connected to the connectors 52 at each end. (See, e.g., FIG. 1 and col. 3, lines 24-41 of O'Brien). Then, the upper mold 22 is closed onto the lower mold 24 and the polymer foam is introduced through the upper mold. *Id.* After the polymer foam sets, the formed wire harness 70 is removed from the mold 20. *Id.* As such, unlike claim 1, the mold 20 of O'Brien is not a molded body that is part of an electronic assembly and is formed around the wire harness.

Nor is the mold 20 of O'Brien formed to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors, as recited in claim 1. In support of this, O'Brien teaches that when the upper mold 22 is closed onto the lower mold 24, the connectors are completely encased within the mold 20, thereby providing no access to the connectors. (See, e.g., FIG. 1 of O'Brien). Access to the connectors of O'Brien may only be provided when the mold 20 is open. However, in this latter configuration, the mold 20 of O'Brien does not completely encapsulate the wire harness. As such, unlike claim 1, the mold 20 of O'Brien is unable to **simultaneously**, completely encapsulate the wiring harness **and** provide access to the connectors.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over O'Brien.

Claims 8, 11-12 and 25 are patentable over O'Brien at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 17 is patentable over O'Brien for at least the same reasons as provided above for claim 1 and for the features recited therein. Specifically, claim 17 is patentable over O'Brien at least because this claim recites an electronic assembly comprising, *inter alia*, a molded body formed around the wire harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate said wiring harness and to cover a portion of each of said plurality of connectors so as to provide access to each of the plurality of connectors. As noted above, O'Brien is silent as to these features.

Claim 18 is patentable over O'Brien at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 17 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 20 is patentable over O'Brien for at least the same reasons as provided above for claim 1 and for the features recited therein. Specifically, claim 20 is patentable over O'Brien at least because this claim recites an electronic assembly comprising, *inter alia*, a molded body formed around the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate said wiring harness and to cover a portion of each of said plurality of connectors so as to provide access to each of the plurality of connectors, said molded body including a base portion that extends between said plurality of connectors. As mentioned previously, O'Brien is silent as to these features.

Claim 21 is patentable over O'Brien for at least the same reasons as provided above for claim 1 and for the features recited therein. Specifically, claim 21 is patentable over O'Brien at least because this claim recites an electronic assembly comprising, *inter alia*, a molded body formed around the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate said wiring harness and to cover a portion of each of said plurality of connectors so as to provide access to each of the plurality of connectors.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 8, 11-12, 17-18, 20-21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on O'Brien are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on O'Brien in view of Becker (U.S. Pat. No. 5,107,989). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-5 are patentable over O'Brien at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Becker fails to remedy the deficiencies of O'Brien. Becker merely discloses a container for packaging electronic components which are susceptible to damage from electrostatic discharge or fields. (See, e.g., col. 1, lines 58-63 of Becker). However, Becker is silent as to an electronic assembly, which comprises, *inter alia*, "a molded body formed around the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and

provide access to the connectors," as required by claims 3-5. Therefore, any reasonable combination of O'Brien and Becker cannot result, in any way, in the invention of claims 3-5.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on O'Brien in view of Becker are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 6-10, 13-17, 19 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hull *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,186,915) in view of O'Brien. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an electronic assembly, which comprises, *inter alia*, "a molded body formed around the wiring harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors."

As conceded by the Office Action, Hull fails to disclose, teach or suggest a wiring harness and a molded body formed to completely encapsulate the wiring harness. (See paragraph 5 of the Office Action). Hull merely discloses a mud box for use in poured concrete construction. (See, e.g., col. 1, lines 10-12 of Hull). The mud box of Hull is a molded box that has three exterior connectors that extend outwardly from each sidewall of the box. (See, e.g., FIG. 1 and col. 3, lines 17-23 of Hull). Hull discloses that the **molded box is open on the front side and the rear side thereof**. (See, e.g., col. 3, line 25 of Hull). As such, the molded box of Hull is clearly unable to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors, as recited in claim 1.

O'Brien fails to remedy the deficiencies of Hull. As noted previously, the mold 20 of O'Brien is not part of an electronic assembly and does not completely encapsulate the wiring harness. Nor is the mold 20 of O'Brien formed to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate the wiring harness and provide access to the connectors, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, any proper combination of Hull and O'Brien cannot result, in any way, in the invention of claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the assembly of Hull with a wiring harness and to completely encapsulate the wiring harness. Applicants respectfully disagree with this determination.

Firstly, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to provide a wiring harness within the molded box of Hull because the molded box of Hull would not allow connection between the wiring harness and the exterior connectors. In support of this, Hull discloses that the molded box includes four full sides that each support three exterior connectors. As can be seen in FIG. 1 of Hull, none of these sides have openings that extend therethrough. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would not

be motivated to provide a wiring harness within the molded box of Hull in the manner the Examiner has proposed.

Secondly, Hull teaches that the molded box is specifically constructed to be open on the front side and rear side thereof in order to receive a ceiling adapter. As such, modifying the box of Hull to completely encapsulate the wiring harness in the manner the Examiner has proposed would defeat the intended purpose of Hull, which is to provide a box that is open on the front side and rear side thereof. Accordingly, per MPEP §2145, the Examiner's proposed modification of Hull is improper.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Hull and O'Brien fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 2, 6-10, 13-16 and 24 are patentable over Hull, O'Brien and any combination thereof at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claim 17 is patentable over Hull, O'Brien and any combination thereof for at least similar reasons as provided for claim 1 and for the features recited therein. For example, Hull, O'Brien and any combination thereof do not disclose, teach or suggest an electronic assembly comprising, *inter alia*, a molded body formed around the wire harness to, simultaneously, completely encapsulate said wiring harness and to cover a portion of each of said plurality of connectors so as to provide access to each of the plurality of connectors.

Claim 19 is patentable over Hull, O'Brien and any combination thereof at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 17 and for the additional features recited therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 6-10, 13-17, 19 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hull in view of O'Brien are respectfully requested.

Applicants have addressed the Examiner's rejections and objections and respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

for CHRISTOPHE F. LAIR
Reg. No. 54248
Tel. No. 703.770.7797
Fax No. 703.770.7901

CFL/smm
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900